



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,643	02/28/2007	Bjarne Pedersen	VWS-376US	5543
83583	7590	09/01/2011		
Wood, Herron & Evans, LLP (Vestas Wind Systems)				
441 Vine Street				
2700 Carew Tower				
Cincinnati, OH 45202				
EXAMINER				
CIGNA, JACOB				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3726				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/01/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

amalik@whepatent.com

cobrien@whepatent.com

USPTODOCK@whepatent.com

<i>Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/573,643	PEDERSEN, BJARNE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JACOB CIGNA	3726	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) JACOB CIGNA (3) _____
 (2) Dr. Benintendi (4) _____

Date of Interview: 23 August 2011.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Issues Discussed ☐ 101 ☐ 112 ☐ 102 ☐ 103 ☒ Others
 (For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 4.

Identification of prior art discussed: Weitkamp (EP 1 101 934 A2).

Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Applicant recordation instructions: The formal written reply to the last Office action must include the substance of the interview. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, applicant is given a non-extendable period of the longer of one month or thirty days from this interview date, or the mailing date of this interview summary form, whichever is later, to file a statement of the substance of the interview.

Examiner recordation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

/JACOB J CIGNA/
 Examiner, Art Unit 3726

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135 (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Applicant's counsel Dr. Benintendi opened the interview with a discussion of the interview dated 9 May 2011 in which Applicant's previous counsel had attempted to overcome the prior art of Weitkamp by adding the limitation "receiving the entire load" in reference to the connecting means. During that interview, Examiner Cigna agreed that the feature of Weitkamp construed to be the connecting means does not receive the entire load of the crane as would be required by the claim. Examiner Cigna further commented that the limitation to "the entire load" is a very narrow claim. Dr. Benintendi stated that his client is apprehensive of such a narrow claim because it is conceivably easily overcome by adding a minor feature to the crane by which the crane is not entirely loaded on the connecting means. Dr. Benintendi also brought forth the idea that since the crane is connected to the gangway as shown in Applicant's Figure 1, that it is possible that the gangway's connection to the ladder, and ultimately the nacelle alleviates some of the load of the crane from the connecting means. Dr. Benintendi offered the suggestion that the claim limitation to "the entire load" be changed to "substantially the entire load" which is intended to convey that it is the vast majority of the load of the crane which is held by the connecting means, and would prevent a competitor from adding an inconsequential load-bearing component to overcome the claim limitation "entire load." Examiner Cigna informed Dr. Benintendi that the Examiner did not have negotiating authority and could not comment as to the patentability of the proposed claim amendment. Examiner Cigna brought forth three questions regarding applicant's specification, and applicant's understanding of the prior art. First, Examiner wished to make clear Applicant's understanding of the term "crane" as it is referred to in the specification, considering Examiner's experience that "crane" is poorly defined in the art. Examiner puts on the record that it is clear that the crane is comprised of the mast 30 and the jib 31 as described in Paragraph 0034 of the specification. Thus, the connecting means (connecting piece) 5 is not apart of the crane. Examiner's second question was in regards to the Prior Art Weitkamp. Examiner questioned whether Applicant thought it was possible for the previously cited "connecting means" of Weitkamp to provide for "substantially the entire load" of the crane. Dr. Benintendi stated that it does not seem possible for the connecting means as cited of Weitkamp to provide such a limitation, considering the structure of the arms 54, and that the cables 68 appear to be intended for positioning purposes rather than structural load bearing purposes. Lastly, Examiner Cigna pointed out that it is the motor 60 of Weitkamp which provides the motive force for the lifting and lowering of the turbine components. Cigna inquired as to the motive force of Applicant's invention and it was agreed upon that even if no disclosure is in the specification, that it is well known in the art to have a motor of the jib near the trolley 41 as shown in Figure 8. It was also agreed that there is no line going from the jib to the nacelle, hub, or turbine mast which might be analogous to the motor cable of Weitkamp. Dr. Benintendi asked Cigna whether a further search would be required. Examiner Cigna said that a further search would be required, but Examiner Cigna believed that the best art had probably already been found for the case. Dr. Benintendi gave his opinion that it is rare for cranes to be positioned on turbine hubs instead of the nacelle. A further interview may be set up in the near future.